

# Graded parafermions: standard and quasi-particle bases

P. Jacob and P. Mathieu

*Département de physique,*

*Université Laval,*

*Québec, Canada G1K 7P4*

(pjacob@phy.ulaval.ca, pmathieu@phy.ulaval.ca)

## Abstract

Two bases of states are presented for modules of the graded parafermionic conformal field theory associated to the coset  $\widehat{osp}(1,2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$ . The first one is formulated in terms of the two fundamental (i.e., lowest dimensional) parafermionic modes. In that basis, one can identify the completely reducible representations, i.e., those whose modules contain an infinite number of singular vectors; the explicit form of these vectors is also given. The second basis is a quasi-particle basis, determined in terms of a modified version of the  $\mathbb{Z}_{2k}$  exclusion principle. A novel feature of this model is that none of its bases are fully ordered and this reflects a hidden structural  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  exclusion principle.

## 1. Introduction

Conformal fields theories are normally described in terms of the representation theory of the extended conformal algebra. However, they can also be described in terms of some quasi-particle excitations. This provides a quite interesting complementary formulation, interesting both from the physical and the mathematical points of view.

On the mathematical side, a quasi-particle basis leads to fermionic-sum expressions for the characters, with an underlying Andrews-Gordon-type combinatorics. Such characters are quite distinct in their structure from the standard bosonic-type characters derived from a Verma module description with singular-vector subtractions.<sup>1</sup> Constructing both the bosonic and fermionic characters of a given theory provides a field theoretical derivation of some highly nontrivial mathematical identities.

On the other hand, a description of a CFT in terms of quasi-particles is manifestly closer to the usual quantum field theoretical framework. It can be viewed as a reformulation of the CFT in preparation for an integrable perturbation to be described, off-critically, in terms of the corresponding massive excitations [1].

The physical interpretation of the quasi-particle excitations is not always transparent however. This point can be neatly illustrated with the particular case of the Lepowsky-Primc characters [4], the prototype of fermionic-sum representations of CFT characters. These characters count the number of states at each level for a generic basis spanned by some creation operators  $\mathcal{C}_n$  – subject to a given (generalized) commutation relation – acting on a highest-weight state  $|\varphi\rangle$  and ordered as

$$\mathcal{C}_{-n_1}\mathcal{C}_{-n_2}\dots\mathcal{C}_{-n_p}|\varphi\rangle \qquad n_i \geq n_{i+1} \geq 1 \qquad (1.1)$$

up to some boundary condition (i.e., a constraint on the maximal number of 1's), with the further requirement that

$$n_i \geq n_{i+k-1} + 2 \qquad (1.2)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> The qualitative ‘bosonic’ and ‘fermionic’ for character-sum representations are explained in more details in [1, 2] and in the introduction of [3], where the origin of the fermionic sums in CFT is also traced back.

This is the core restriction; it characterizes the combinatorics of the Andrews-Gordon identities that generalize those of Rogers-Ramanujan-Schur.<sup>2</sup> The above restriction is rooted in the existence of one relation at the level of fields, a relation that is model dependent. The original derivation of Lepowsky-Primc applies to the coset  $\widehat{su}(2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  and the relation that leads to the restriction rule is (cf. [4], prop. 5.5)

$$e(z)^{k+1} = f(z)^{k+1} = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

More precisely,  $e(z)^{k+1}$  or  $f(z)^{k+1}$ , applied on any field associated to a state in an integrable  $\widehat{su}(2)_k$  module, vanishes. This null-field condition leads to a linear relation among the spanning states at a given grade, whose effect is captured by the restriction rule (1.2).<sup>3</sup>

Now these characters, in a slightly modified form, also turn out to provide a fermionic-sum representation for the Virasoro minimal models  $\mathcal{M}(2, 2k+1)$  [6, 7]. In this context, the restriction rule is rooted in the null field condition  $T(z)^k + \dots$  (the power of  $T$  being suitably normal ordered and the dots stand for a differential polynomial in  $T$  of degree  $2k$ ). This is the field version of the non-trivial vacuum singular vector, the one at level  $2k$  [7, 8]. Although the mathematical structure of the irreducible modules of the  $\widehat{su}(2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  and the  $\mathcal{M}(2, 2k+1)$  models are similar – i.e., there exists a linear relation that depends upon  $k$ ), their physical excitations are quite different.<sup>4</sup> In fact, the Virasoro modes (in terms of which the  $\mathcal{M}(2, 2k+1)$  space of states are described) can even not be regarded as physical

---

<sup>2</sup> Note that an equivalent way of formulating this basis is by writing the states (1.1) under the form

$$\overleftarrow{\prod}_{i \geq 1} (\mathcal{C}_{-i})^{a_i} |\varphi\rangle \quad a_i \geq 0$$

where the arrow indicates that the index  $i$  increases toward the left; the constraint (1.2) is equivalent to imposing  $a_i + a_{i+1} < k$ .

<sup>3</sup> Here  $e$  and  $f$  are the ‘raising’ and ‘lowering’  $\widehat{su}(2)$  currents in the Chevalley basis. This relation is easily shown for  $k = 1$  and the result is lifted to general  $k$  by tensor product. The same relation also appears in the  $\widehat{su}(2)_k$  fermionic bases constructed in [5].

<sup>4</sup> Another example exhibiting a similar mathematical structure but with a quite different source for the constraining linear relation, is provided by the spinon description of the  $\widehat{su}(k)_1$  WZW models [9, 10, 11]. In that case, the restrictions on the ordered spanning states originates from the Yangian symmetry inherited from the finitized version of the theory, the Haldane-Shastry spin chain [12]; it also leads to restriction rules incorporating (1.2) – cf. the first reference in [11], app. A.

quasi-particles. Actually, even in the first case, the physical meaning of the excitations is not clear at once. However, their proper interpretation is unveiled in the observation that  $\widehat{su}(2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  is a coset representation of the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  parafermionic theory [13].

The parafermionic quasi-particle basis has been derived in [3] using solely the defining generalized commutation relations. The mere  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  invariance – that is,  $(\psi_1)^k \sim \mathbb{I}$ , where  $\psi_1$  is the fundamental parafermion –, has then been identified as the source for the restriction rule (1.2). Therefore, the mathematical structure underlying the restrictions rules is, in some sense, built in the theory, in the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  invariance of the OPE’s. Moreover, in this context, the quasi-particle excitations have a natural physical interpretation: these are the modes of the parafermionic field  $\psi_1$ , say  $\mathcal{A}$ , which are subject to a  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  exclusion principle, which takes the following form: all ordered sequences of  $\mathcal{A}$  operators that contain any one of the following  $k$ -string

$$(\mathcal{A}_{-(n+1)})^{k-i}(\mathcal{A}_{-n})^i \quad (i = 0, \dots, k-1) \quad (1.4)$$

must be forbidden. Excluding the states (1.4) amounts to enforce (1.2).<sup>5</sup>

These observations suggest that the parafermionic approach followed in [3], in addition to remain close to the physics, would also be the simplest one for deriving quasi-particle bases for generalized cosets of the form  $\widehat{g}_k/\widehat{u}(1)^r$ ,  $r$  being the rank of  $\widehat{g}$  (and, of course, this is the only tool at hand for more general parafermionic models that do not have such a simple coset structure, such as the models described in app. A of [13]).

The aim of this paper is to supply a partial evidence for this ‘contention’, by presenting the derivation of a novel quasi-particle basis, the one pertaining to the graded  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  parafermions related to the coset  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$ . This model has originally been proposed in [19]. As a side result, we also display the form of the ‘standard basis’, the structure of the singular vectors and fix the spectrum of the completely degenerate representations. The characters will be presented in a sequel article.

---

<sup>5</sup> The interpretation of this condition in terms of an exclusion principle goes back to [14]. A more recent discussion can be found in [15]. For another formulation of the generalized exclusion principle as a constraint on a basis of states, see [16]. Also, the connection between such type of exclusion principle and the Haldane’s generalization [17] is clarified in [18].

## 2. The graded $\mathbb{Z}_k$ model

### 2.1. The OPEs

The graded version of the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  parafermionic theory, or more precisely, the parafermionic theory defined by the coset  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k / \widehat{u}(1)$  where  $k$  is a positive integer, contains the following set of parafermionic fields:  $\psi_r$ ,  $r = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \dots, k - \frac{1}{2}$ , of dimension

$$h_{\psi_r} = \frac{r(k-r)}{k} + \frac{\epsilon_r}{2} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\epsilon_r = 0$  if  $r$  is integer and 1 otherwise. Note that  $\psi_r = \psi_{k-r}^\dagger$  and  $\psi_0 = \mathbb{I}$ . The dimension of the lowest dimensional parafermion  $\psi_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , is thus  $1 - 1/4k$ . The defining OPEs read

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_r(z) \psi_s(w) &\sim \frac{c_{r,s}}{(z-w)^{2rs/k + \epsilon_r \epsilon_s}} \psi_{r+s}(w) \quad (r+s < k) \\ \psi_r(z) \psi_s^\dagger(w) &\sim \frac{c_{r,k-s}}{(z-w)^{2\min(r,s) - 2rs/k + \epsilon_r \epsilon_s}} \psi_{k+r-s}(w) \quad (r+s < k) \\ \psi_r(z) \psi_r^\dagger(w) &\sim \frac{1}{(z-w)^{2r(k-r)/k + \epsilon_r}} \left[ \mathbb{I} + (z-w)^2 \{ \epsilon_r \mathcal{O}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(w) + (1 - \epsilon_r) \mathcal{O}^{(1)}(w) \} + \dots \right] \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathcal{O}^{(\frac{1}{2})}$  and  $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}$  are two currents of dimension 2, whose difference is proportional to the energy-momentum tensor [19]

$$T(z) = \frac{2k}{2k+3} \left[ \mathcal{O}^{(1)}(z) - \mathcal{O}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(z) \right] \quad (2.3)$$

This expression is forced by associativity and it agrees with the one derived by the coset construction, the zero-mode of  $\mathcal{O}^{(1)} - \mathcal{O}^{(\frac{1}{2})}$  being proportional to the  $osp(1, 2)$  Casimir, up to a  $u(1)$  contribution. Associativity also fixes the central charge to be

$$c = \frac{-3}{2k+3} = \frac{k}{k+3/2} - 1 \quad (2.4)$$

This is again in agreement with the value calculated from the coset description, which is given by the last equality: the dimension of  $osp(1, 2)$  being  $1 = 3 - 2$  – three even and two odd generators – and the dual Coxeter is  $3/2$ . This model will be referred to as the  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  parafermionic theory.

The structure constants  $c_{r,s}$  are also fixed by associativity. In [19], they have been obtained mainly by means of a free-field representation. A direct implementation of associativity, reformulated in a somewhat simplified form, is presented in [20].

The  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  parafermionic algebra being a subalgebra of the  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  model, we can fix the charge normalization from the former theory: the charge of  $\psi_r$  will then be  $2r$  (and the charge is defined modulo  $2k$ ).

## 2.2. The generalized commutation relations

The parafermionic modes are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{\frac{1}{2}}(z)\phi_q(0) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} z^{-q/2k-m-1} B_{(1+2q)/4k+m} \phi_q(0) \\
\psi_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\dagger}(z)\phi_q(0) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} z^{q/2k-m-1} B_{(1-2q)/4k+m}^{\dagger} \phi_q(0) \\
\psi_1(z)\phi_q(0) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} z^{-q/k-m-1} A_{(1+q)/k+m} \phi_q(0) \\
\psi_1^{\dagger}(z)\phi_q(0) &= \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} z^{q/k-m-1} A_{(1-q)/k+m}^{\dagger} \phi_q(0)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

We will make use of the convention

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}_n|\phi_q\rangle &\equiv B_{n+(1+2q)/4k}|\phi_q\rangle, & \mathcal{B}_n^{\dagger}|\phi_q\rangle &\equiv B_{n+(1-2q)/4k}^{\dagger}|\phi_q\rangle \\
\mathcal{A}_n|\phi_q\rangle &\equiv A_{n+(1+q)/k}|\phi_q\rangle, & \mathcal{A}_n^{\dagger}|\phi_q\rangle &\equiv A_{n+(1-q)/k}^{\dagger}|\phi_q\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

that is, the fractional parts will not be written down explicitly. By evaluating the integral [13,19]

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi i)^2} \oint_{C_1} dw \oint_{C_2} dz z^{qr/k+n'} w^{qs/k+m'} (z-w)^t \psi_r(z) \psi_s(w) \phi_q(0) \tag{2.7}$$

with appropriate values of  $r, s$  – recall that  $\psi_p^{\dagger} = \psi_{k-p}$  – and  $t$  (and by redefining  $n'$  and  $m'$  by suitable shifts), we find the following generalized commutation relations [19]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{-1-1/2k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{B}_{n-l-1} \mathcal{B}_{m+l+1}^{\dagger} - \mathcal{B}_{m-l}^{\dagger} \mathcal{B}_{n+l} \right] \phi_q(0) \\
&\quad = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{q}{2k} + n \right) \left( \frac{q}{2k} + n - 1 \right) \delta_{n+m,0} + \mathcal{O}_{n+m}^{(\frac{1}{2})} \right] \phi_q(0) \\
&\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{-1-2/k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{A}_{n-l-1} \mathcal{A}_{m+l+1}^{\dagger} + \mathcal{A}_{m-l}^{\dagger} \mathcal{A}_{n+l} \right] \phi_q(0) \\
&\quad = \left[ \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{q}{k} + n \right) \left( \frac{q}{k} + n - 1 \right) \delta_{n+m,0} + \mathcal{O}_{n+m}^{(1)} \right] \phi_q(0) \\
&\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{-1/k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{A}_{n-l} \mathcal{B}_{m+l}^{\dagger} - \mathcal{B}_{m-l}^{\dagger} \mathcal{A}_{n+l} \right] \phi_q(0) = c_{1,k-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{B}_{n+m} \phi_q(0) \\
&\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{1/2k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{B}_{n-l} \mathcal{B}_{m+l} + \mathcal{B}_{m-l} \mathcal{B}_{n+l} \right] \phi_q(0) = c_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{A}_{n+m} \phi_q(0) \\
&\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{1+1/2k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{B}_{n-l} \mathcal{B}_{m+l} - \mathcal{B}_{m+1-l} \mathcal{B}_{n-1+l} \right] \phi_q(0) = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

together with the dagger version of the last three relations.  $C_t^{(l)}$  stands for the binomial coefficient:

$$C_t^{(l)} = \frac{\Gamma(l-t)}{l! \Gamma(-t)} \quad (2.9)$$

The fractional part of  $t$  is fixed by the field content of the integrand (i.e., the values of  $r, s, q$ ). By varying its integer part, we can pick up different contributions in the OPE of  $\psi_r$  and  $\psi_s$  - cf. the fourth vs the fifth relations (and other variants will be introduced when required). The relative signs on the left hand side have various contributions: the parity of the integer power of  $t$ , the fermionic/bosonic nature of the two fields  $\psi_r, \psi_s$  and, of course, the minus sign that comes from taking the difference between the  $|z| > |w|$  and  $|z| < |w|$  contribution.

### 2.3. Highest-weight conditions

The highest-weight conditions ( $q$  being the charge of  $\tilde{\varphi}_q$ , always chosen to be positive) are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_n |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= \mathcal{A}_n |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0 & n \geq 0 \\ \mathcal{B}_{n+1}^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= \mathcal{A}_{n+1}^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0 & n \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Note that the condition on  $\mathcal{B}$  implies that on  $\mathcal{A}$  (using the fourth relation in (2.8)) but the constraint  $\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0$  cannot be deduced from the  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  condition. These highest-weight conditions imply

$$\mathcal{O}_n^{(\frac{1}{2})} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = \mathcal{O}_n^{(1)} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = L_n |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0 \quad n \geq 1 \quad (2.11)$$

## 3. The $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$ standard basis

### 3.1. Reviewing the $\mathbb{Z}_k$ standard basis

The aim of this section is to obtain the space of states in highest-weight modules in the ‘standard basis’, the one that generates the Verma modules. It is constructed from strings of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  operators.

This derivation will rely heavily on results of the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  case. So in this subsection we first recall the description of the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  standard basis obtained in [21]. The set of independent

states at level (grade)  $s$  in the highest-weight Verma module of  $|\varphi_\ell\rangle$ <sup>6</sup>, the highest-weight conditions being

$$\mathcal{A}_n|\varphi_\ell\rangle = \mathcal{A}_{n+1}^\dagger|\varphi_\ell\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for } n \geq 0 \quad (3.1)$$

and with relative charge  $2r$ , is found to be generated by the following states [21]:

$$\mathcal{A}_{-n_1}\mathcal{A}_{-n_2}\dots\mathcal{A}_{-n_p}\mathcal{A}_{-m_1}^\dagger\mathcal{A}_{-m_2}^\dagger\dots\mathcal{A}_{-m_{p'}}^\dagger|\varphi_\ell\rangle \quad (3.2)$$

with

$$p - p' = r, \quad n_i \geq n_{i+1} \geq 1, \quad m_i \geq m_{i+1} \geq 0, \quad \sum_{i=1}^p n_i + \sum_{i=1}^{p'} m_i = s \quad (3.3)$$

### 3.2. A bijection between $\mathbb{Z}_k$ $\mathcal{A}$ -strings and $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$ $\mathcal{B}$ -strings

The argument presented in [21] extends directly to the graded model, with the  $\mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$  modes replaced by the  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  ones.<sup>7</sup> In particular, the  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  strings can be ordered separately but there is no mixed ordering.

There is however an important difference in the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  and the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  ordering conditions that hold for each separate strings of a given type of modes. To study this question, we will establish a correspondence between a  $p$ -string of  $\mathcal{B}$  operators in the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  model and a  $p$ -string of  $\mathcal{A}$  operators in the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  and use this to derive the  $\mathcal{B}$ -ordering constraint for the  $\mathcal{A}$  one.

This correspondence is suggested by the comparison of the following two sets of commutation relations (where we omit the  $\phi_q(0)$  term on each side), pertaining respectively to the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  and the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  models:

$$\begin{aligned} (i) \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{1+1/2k}^{(l)} [\mathcal{B}_{n-l}\mathcal{B}_{m+l} - \mathcal{B}_{m+1-l}\mathcal{B}_{n-1+l}] = 0 \\ (ii) \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{1/2k}^{(l)} [\mathcal{B}_{n-l}\mathcal{B}_{m+l} + \mathcal{B}_{m+l}\mathcal{B}_{n+l}] = c_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{B}_{m+n}^{(2)} \\ (iii) \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{1/k}^{(l)} [\mathcal{B}_{n-l}\mathcal{B}_{m+l}^{(2)} + \mathcal{B}_{m+l}^{(2)}\mathcal{B}_{n+l}] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

---

<sup>6</sup> The absence of a tilde distinguishes the usual  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  primary fields from the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  ones.

<sup>7</sup> It should be stressed that  $\mathcal{B}$  in [21] refers to  $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$  and not the present  $\mathcal{B}$ .



and

$$\begin{aligned}
(i) \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{2/k}^{(l)} [\mathcal{A}_{n-l} \mathcal{A}_{m+l} - \mathcal{A}_{m-l} \mathcal{A}_{n+l}] = 0 \\
(ii) \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{2/k-1}^{(l)} [\mathcal{A}_{n-l} \mathcal{A}_{m+l} + \mathcal{A}_{m+l-1} \mathcal{A}_{n+l+1}] = c_{1,1} \mathcal{A}_{m+n}^{(2)} \\
(iii) \quad & \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{4/k-1}^{(l)} [\mathcal{A}_{n-l} \mathcal{A}_{m+l}^{(2)} + \mathcal{A}_{m+l-1}^{(2)} \mathcal{A}_{n+l+1}] = c_{1,2} \mathcal{A}_{n+m}^{(3)}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

Here  $\mathcal{B}^{(n)}$  stands for the modes of the parafermion  $\psi_{n/2}$ , so that  $\mathcal{B}^{(2)} \sim \mathcal{A}$ , and similarly  $\mathcal{A}^{(n)}$  stands for the modes of the parafermion  $\psi_n$ . In each case, the second relation is a simple variant of the first one but taking an extra pole.

Disregarding for the moment the obvious difference between the right hand side of both versions of (iii), one observes a manifest structural analogy between both sets of relations. However, a closer look reveals a dissimilarity rooted in the relative shifts of the indices of the second factor of the left hand side of each relation: it is readily observed that the mode indices on the second term of each  $\mathcal{B}$  commutator are shifted by  $+1$  and  $-1$  when compared to the  $\mathcal{A}$  terms of the corresponding commutator. This means that the  $\mathcal{B}$  basis is a priori less constrained.

The ordering constraints are encoded in the relations (i). The relations (ii) is displayed in order to show that no further information can be obtained by picking out an extra pole in the  $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B}$  commutator: as for the  $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}$  commutator, taking an extra pole brings down another field. This ensures that given the map from  $\mathcal{A}$  to  $\mathcal{B}$  strings, we will be allowed to extract the  $\mathcal{B}$ -ordering condition out of the  $\mathcal{A}$  one.

Given the above observation concerning the difference in mode indices and given that the  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  highest-weight conditions are similar, we define the following map:

$$(n'_1, \dots, n'_p) = (n_1, \dots, n_p) + (p-1, p-2, \dots, 1, 0) \tag{3.6}$$

where we used the notation

$$\mathcal{A}_{-n'_1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{-n'_p} \sim (n'_1, \dots, n'_p) \quad \mathcal{B}_{-n_1} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{-n_p} \sim (n_1, \dots, n_p) \tag{3.7}$$

Therefore, upon subtracting the staircase partition from a general partition describing an ordered  $\mathcal{A}$ -string, we thus map the  $\mathcal{A}$ -ordering condition  $n'_i \geq n'_{i+1}$  into a weaker one

$$n'_i \geq n'_{i+1} \implies n_i \geq n_{i+1} - 1 \tag{3.8}$$

holding to  $\mathcal{B}$  strings. The application (3.7) is manifestly a bijection. Note that  $(n_1, \dots, n_p)$  is not a partition.

We thus see that the minor-looking difference between the type-( $i$ ) commutation relations has in fact a rather dramatic effect on the ordered basis: while the  $\mathcal{A}$  index cannot increase from right to left, in the  $\mathcal{B}$  case, it can increase by one at each single step.

Let us illustrate the effect of this difference for the ordering of a sequence of  $n + 2$  operators, considering only the commutator (i) in (3.4) and (3.5), by listing the independent strings, at the first few levels, acting on some highest-weight state

|         | $\mathcal{A}$ – type (using only (i))                                        | $\mathcal{B}$ – type (using only (i))                                                         |       |
|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| $s = 1$ | $\mathcal{A}_{-1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{-1}$                                   | $\mathcal{B}_n \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}$                       |       |
| $s = 2$ | $\mathcal{A}_{-2} \mathcal{A}_{-1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{-1}$                  | $\mathcal{B}_{n-1} \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \mathcal{B}_{n-2} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}$ | (3.9) |
| $s = 3$ | $\mathcal{A}_{-3} \mathcal{A}_{-1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{-1}$                  | $\mathcal{B}_{n-2} \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}$                   |       |
|         | $\mathcal{A}_{-2} \mathcal{A}_{-2} \mathcal{A}_{-1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{-1}$ | $\mathcal{B}_{n-1} \mathcal{B}_{n-2} \mathcal{B}_{n-2} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}$ |       |

### 3.3. A hidden $\mathbb{Z}_3$ exclusion principle

Now, given that  $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B} \sim \mathcal{A}$ , and that the  $\mathcal{A}$  basis is ordered, we expect that the other commutation relations (ii) and (iii) of (3.4) will provide further constraints. Using the bijection just described, we would like to study the effect of these constraints by unraveling those encoded in the commutation relations (ii) and (iii) of (3.5). But at this point, the difference between both versions of (iii) become relevant: it would be legitimate to use the bijection only if we had  $\mathcal{A}_{n+m}^{(3)} = 0$ . However, this is never possible. The closest we can get to this is to enforce

$$\mathcal{A}_{n+m}^{(3)} \sim \delta_{n+m,0} \quad (3.10)$$

which holds only for the  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  model (where  $\psi_3 \sim (\psi_1)^3 \sim \mathbb{I}$ ). But fortunately, as far as the constraints on a basis are concerned, this delta term is meaningless.

Now, extracting the constraints encoded in (ii) and (iii) of (3.5) when  $k = 3$  on a free ordered basis simply amounts to describe the underlying  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  quasi-particle  $\mathcal{A}$ -type basis. And for this we can rely on the results of [3]: the  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  quasi-particle basis is obtained by excluding, in any ordered string of  $\mathcal{A}$  operators, all those containing one of the following 3-strings:

$$(\mathcal{A}_{-(n'+1)})^{3-i} (\mathcal{A}_{-n'})^i \quad \forall n' \geq 1, \quad (i = 0, 1, 2) \quad (3.11)$$

Equivalently, the ordered sequences of  $\mathcal{A}$  operators  $\mathcal{A}_{-n'_1} \cdots \mathcal{A}_{-n'_p}$  are subject to the condition

$$n'_i \geq n'_{i+2} + 2 \quad (3.12)$$

Now, by subtracting the staircase partition, this condition translates into

$$n_i \geq n_{i+2} \quad (3.13)$$

In other words, the next-nearest neighbors are ordered. This condition ensures that when paired two by two, the composite  $\mathcal{B}$  indices are ordered:

$$n_i + n_{i+1} \geq n_{i+2} + n_{i+3} \quad (3.14)$$

as expected from the identity  $\mathcal{B}\mathcal{B} \sim A$ . Hence, the initially allowed step by step increases in the  $\mathcal{B}$  mode indices is thus finally truncated to a single step possible increase.

Summarizing these results, we have found that  $\mathcal{B}$  strings can only be *partially ordered*: strings of the form

$$\mathcal{B}_{-n_1} \mathcal{B}_{-n_2} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{-n_p} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \quad (3.15)$$

are constrained by the *weak-ordering conditions*:

$$n_i \geq n_{i+1} - 1, \quad n_i \geq n_{i+2} \quad (3.16)$$

In particular, the ground state among all those states containing  $p$  operators  $\mathcal{B}$  is

$$\mathcal{B}_{-i} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1} \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \quad (3.17)$$

with  $i = 0$  if  $p$  is even and 1 otherwise.

We stress that these weak-ordering conditions that have just been obtained are those of a free basis. They do not encode any  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  exclusion principle yet. We used a hidden  $\mathbb{Z}_3$   $\mathcal{A}$ -type exclusion principle only to unravel, in a simple and elegant way, the  $\mathcal{B}$  ordering condition.

### 3.4. The $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$ standard basis summarized

The analysis of the previous section applies as well to  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  strings, which are thus also weakly ordered. In particular, the ground state is of the form the ground state among all those states containing  $p$  is  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^p |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$ . Note that the reason for which the ground state is not  $\mathcal{B}_i^\dagger \cdots \mathcal{B}_1^\dagger \mathcal{B}_0^\dagger \mathcal{B}_1^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  (with  $i = 0$  if  $p$  is even and 1 otherwise) is due to the highest-weight condition  $\mathcal{A}_{n>0}^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0$ , in particular  $\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0$ .

For mixed strings, the set of all states with fixed charge  $r+q$  in the module of highest-weight state  $|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  is then generated by

$$\mathcal{B}_{-n_1} \mathcal{B}_{-n_2} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{-n_p} \mathcal{B}_{-m_1}^\dagger \mathcal{B}_{-m_2}^\dagger \cdots \mathcal{B}_{-m_{p'}}^\dagger |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \quad (3.18)$$

with the weak ordering condition (3.16) applying separately for the  $n$ 's as well as for the  $m$ 's, with  $n_p \geq 1$ ,  $m_{p'} \geq 0$  and  $p - p' = r$ . This is the standard basis of the  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  model.

## 4. The spectrum of the $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$ model

### 4.1. The dimension of the $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$ primary fields

The conformal dimension of a highest-weight state is related to its charge in a way that is fixed by the first two commutators in (2.8) and by the relation (2.3):

$$h_{\tilde{\varphi}_q} = \frac{q(2k-3q)}{4k(2k+3)} \quad (4.1)$$

Observe that the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  symmetry is broken at the level of the vacua:  $\tilde{\varphi}_q^\dagger \neq \tilde{\varphi}_{k-q}$  since they do not have the same dimension.

### 4.2. Reducible modules and singular vectors

For generic values of  $q$ , the modules are irreducible. For  $q$  half-integer, there is one singular vector:  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2q+1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$ . However, when  $q$  is integer and lies in the range  $0 \leq q \leq k$ , we show, by construction, that there is an infinite number of singular vectors.

The simplest way of identifying these singular vectors is to look for states whose dimensions are related to their charge exactly as in (4.1). In this way, we find the following two sequences of singular vectors:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(2\ell+1)(k+2)+q-\ell} (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{(2\ell)(2k+3)+2q+1} \dots (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(k+2)+q} (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2q+1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \\ & (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{(2\ell+2)(2k+3)-2q-1} (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(2\ell+1)(k+2)-q-\ell-1} \dots (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2(2k+3)-2q-1} (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(k+2)-q-1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

The above constraints on  $q$  follow by enforcing all these powers to be positive integers. These expressions are singular for all positive values of  $\ell$ . Each sequence can end either with a  $\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger$  or a  $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$  factor. The powers of  $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$  can be written in a somewhat more natural way as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(2\ell+1)(k+2)+q-\ell} &= (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}[2(2\ell+1)(k+3/2)+2q+1]} \\ (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(2\ell+1)(k+2)-q-\ell-1} &= (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}[2(2\ell+1)(k+3/2)-2q-1]} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

If  $q'$  stands for the charge of one of these singular vectors, the shifted value of the charge (i.e.,  $q + 1/2$ ) is either  $2m(k + 3/2) + q + 1/2$  or  $-2m(k + 3/2) - q - 1/2$  (where  $m$  is either  $2\ell$  or  $2\ell = 1$ ), as expected from the expressions of the  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k$  singular vectors [22].<sup>8</sup>

The singular nature of the first two ‘primary’ singular vectors  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2q+1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  and  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{(k+2)-q-1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  is established in app. A. The argument readily implies that all the vectors (4.2) are singular.

The bosonic character formulae can be written down directly by subtracting and adding successively the contribution of these singular vectors appropriately folded in the module of relative charge  $r$  (see e.g., [21] for the corresponding expressions of the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  characters). These will be presented elsewhere.

---

<sup>8</sup> Denote by  $\hat{J}^\pm, J^0$  the  $\widehat{su}(2)$  currents – which are also the even currents of  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)$  – and by  $j^\pm$  the fermionic generators of  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)$ . One primary singular vector is inherited from the finiteness of the  $osp(1, 2)$  Lie algebra representation characterized by the  $su(2)$  highest weight  $q$ , with highest-weight state  $|q\rangle$ :  $(j_0^-)^{2q+1} |q\rangle$ . The affine singular vector is  $(J_{-1}^+)^{k-q+1} |q\rangle$ . Indeed,  $J_{-1}^+$  increases the grade by one and the weight (Dynkin label) by two. It can be decomposed in a product of fermionic generators as  $j_0^+ j_{-1}^+$ ;  $j_0^+$  increases the weight by one without affecting the grade while  $j_{-1}^+$  increases both the grade and the weight by one. The point is that the state reached by  $j_{-1}^+ (j_0^+ j_{-1}^+)^{k-q}$  is not singular; the singular state is reached by the further action of  $j_0^+$ . Hence the affine singular vector can be expressed solely in terms of the  $\widehat{su}(2)$  generator  $J_{-1}^+$ . The correspondence with the  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  model is obtained as follows: the  $su(2)$  weight  $q$  becomes the  $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  charge and  $j^+ \sim \mathcal{B}$ ,  $j^- \sim \mathcal{B}^\dagger$ ,  $J^+ \sim \mathcal{A}$ ,  $J^- \sim \mathcal{A}^\dagger$ .

### 4.3. The spectrum of fixed-charge highest-weight states and field identifications

Having identified the parafermionic primary fields associated to the completely degenerate representations,  $\tilde{\varphi}_q$  for  $0 \leq q \leq k$ , we now look for the highest-weight states in fixed charge modules. This amounts to determine the possible lengths of the lowest-dimensional strings  $\mathcal{B}_{-i} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1} \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}$  ( $i = 0, 1$ ) and  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^m$  that can be applied on  $|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$ . Of course, the main constraint comes from the two primary singular vectors. Consider first the lowest dimensional string containing  $p$  operators  $\mathcal{B}$ :

$$\mathcal{B}_{-i} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1} \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \equiv |\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(p)}\rangle \quad (4.4)$$

Since  $(\mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1})^{k-q+1} |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  is singular, we set  $p \leq 2(k-q)+1$ . The dimension of these strings is simply<sup>9</sup>

$$h_{\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(p)}} = h_{\tilde{\varphi}_q} + \frac{p(2k-2q-p)}{4k} + \frac{\epsilon^{(p)}}{2} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\epsilon^{(p)} = 1$  (0) if  $p$  is odd (even). On the other hand, we have

$$(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^p |\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \equiv |\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(-p)}\rangle \quad 0 \leq p \leq 2q \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$h_{\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(-p)}} = h_{\tilde{\varphi}_q} + \frac{p(2q-p)}{4k} \quad (4.7)$$

This analysis must be supplemented by the determination of the field identifications. In the present case, this amounts to identify fields having the same conformal dimension

---

<sup>9</sup> The condition  $n_i \geq n_{i+1} - 1$  has been overlooked in [19] and in consequence the lowest-dimensional  $\mathcal{B}$  string is not written in the form  $\mathcal{B}_{-i} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}$ . This affects the resulting dimensions. The contact with the coset fields is done as follows: setting  $p = m - q$  and writing the fields  $\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(\pm p)}$  under the form  $\tilde{\phi}_{\{q;m\}}$ , their dimension can be reexpressed as

$$h_{\{q;m\}} = \frac{q(2q-3k)}{4k(2k+3)} - \frac{m^2}{4k} + \theta(m-q) \left( \frac{m-q}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^{(m-q)}}{2} \right)$$

( $\theta(m-q)$  being the step function). Note that the last term in parenthesis is an integer. The bounds on the values of  $q$  and  $m$  match those induced by the coset description once the field identifications - treated below - are considered. There is another superficial disagreement between our results and those of [19] in that the fractional part  $1/4k$  in  $B$  or  $B^\dagger$  modes (and  $1/k$  in the  $A$  and  $A^\dagger$  ones) is never written; however it is taken into account in the computation of the dimensions.

but charge differing by  $2k$ . We thus look for fields related by  $p+m=2k$ : setting  $p=2k-x$  and using the above bounds, we find  $2q-1 \leq x \leq 2q$ . The charge consideration leads thus to the following two candidate field identifications

$$\begin{aligned} (i) : \quad p &= 2k - 2q + 1, & m &= 2q - 1 \\ (ii) : \quad p &= 2k - 2q, & m &= 2q \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

In both cases, the equality of the conformal dimensions is easily established, leading to the identifications:

$$\mathcal{B}_{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1})^{k-q}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \sim (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2q-1}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{k-q}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \sim (\mathcal{A}_0^\dagger)^q|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \tag{4.10}$$

(which the known  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  one). For  $q=0$  these identifications imply that

$$\tilde{\varphi}_0^{(2k+1)} \sim \tilde{\varphi}_0^{(1)} \quad \tilde{\varphi}_0^{(2k)} \sim \tilde{\varphi}_0^{(0)} \tag{4.11}$$

(the first relation being in fact a consequence of the second one). For the set  $\{\tilde{\varphi}_0^{(p)}\}$ ,  $p$  should thus be restricted to  $0 \leq p \leq 2k-1$ . Taking into account the field identifications, we thus end up with the following candidate, denoted  $\Gamma_{(k)}$ , for the set of fields associated to fixed-charge highest-weight states:

$$\Gamma_{(k)} = \begin{cases} \tilde{\varphi}_q^{(p)}, & 0 \leq p \leq \min(2k-1, 2k-2q+1) \\ \tilde{\varphi}_q^{(-p)}, & 1 \leq p \leq \max(1, 2q-2) \end{cases} \tag{4.12}$$

For instance, for  $k=2$ , it reads

$$\Gamma_{(2)} = \left\{ \tilde{\varphi}_0^{(0,1,2,3)}, \tilde{\varphi}_1^{(0,1,2,3)}, \tilde{\varphi}_2^{(0,1)}, \tilde{\varphi}_2^{(-1,-2)} \right\} \tag{4.13}$$

Although most of these fields in  $\Gamma_{(k)}$  are  $\mathcal{B}$  descendants of  $\tilde{\varphi}_q$ , some are not, e.g.,  $\tilde{\varphi}_2^{(-1,-2)}$  in  $\Gamma_{(2)}$ . However, the mere existence of a  $\mathcal{B}$ -type quasi-particle basis requires, from the onset, that all highest-weight states in a fixed charged sector be expressible as  $\mathcal{B}$ -descendants of  $|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$ . In fact this is indeed so: the states  $|\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(-p)}\rangle$  can be written as<sup>10</sup>

$$|\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(-p)}\rangle = (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^p|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \sim (\mathcal{B}_{-1})^{2q-p}(\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1})^{k-q}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \tag{4.14}$$

---

<sup>10</sup> Hence  $|\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(-p)}\rangle$  is a descendant of  $|\tilde{\varphi}_q^{(2k-p)}\rangle$  but not a  $\mathcal{B}$  descendant; it can be reached by acting with an appropriate combination of an  $\mathcal{O}$ -type operator.

The dimensions are easily checked to match and the charges ( $q - p$  on the left hand side and  $2k - p + q$  on the right hand side) differ by  $2k$ . We thus end up with the following reduced set  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{(k)}$

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{(k)} = \left\{ \tilde{\varphi}_q^{(p)} \mid 0 \leq p \leq \min(2k - 1, 2k - 2q + 1) \right\} \quad (4.15)$$

whose cardinality is  $k^2 + 3k$ . Of course, the set  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{(k)}$  could equally well be described solely in terms of  $\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger$  descendants.

Let us now conclude this section with a remark concerning the limit on the number of parafermions which is induced by the primary singular vectors (and the field identifications). Recall that the parafermionic fields are in correspondence with the states obtained by the lowest-energy strings of parafermionic modes on the vacuum, i.e.,

$$\psi_r(0)|0\rangle \sim \mathcal{B}_{-i} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1}|0\rangle \quad i = 0 \ (1) \quad \text{if } 2r \text{ is even (odd)} \quad (4.16)$$

The singular vector  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{k+1}|0\rangle$  yields an upper bound on  $2r$ :  $2r < k + 1$ .<sup>11</sup> However, we can similarly generate the parafermions from the  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  states as

$$\psi_r^\dagger(0)|0\rangle \sim \mathcal{B}_{-i}^\dagger \cdots \mathcal{B}_0^\dagger \mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger|0\rangle \quad i = 0 \ (1) \quad \text{if } 2r \text{ is even (odd)} \quad (4.17)$$

(and not  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^r|0\rangle$  since this is a descendant of a singular state). At first sight there seems to be no constraint on the length of such strings. It is however also a consequence of the singular vector  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{k+1}|0\rangle$  appropriately folded. Take for simplicity the case where  $r$  is integer, so that  $\psi_r^\dagger(0)|0\rangle \sim (\mathcal{A}_{-1}^\dagger)^r|0\rangle$ . The singular vector  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{k+1}|0\rangle$  can be folded in the  $-2r$  charged sector by the action of the operator  $(\mathcal{A}_0^\dagger)^{r+k+1}$ . Note however that the resulting state has level  $k + 1$ . Hence, it can only subtract the state  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1}^\dagger)^r|0\rangle$  for  $r = k + 1$ . We thus recover that same constraint as previously.

---

<sup>11</sup> As already pointed out, there is a more restrictive bound – preventing  $(\mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1})^k|0\rangle$  and  $\mathcal{B}_{-1}(\mathcal{B}_0 \mathcal{B}_{-1})^k|0\rangle$  to correspond to novel fields – which is induced by the field identification  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^k|0\rangle \sim |0\rangle$ . But this is not our main point here.



#### 4.4. The $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_1$ model

For  $k = 1$ , the central charge of the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  model reduces to  $-3/5$ , which is that of the  $\mathcal{M}(3, 5)$  Virasoro minimal model. The spectrum of the  $\mathcal{M}(3, 5)$  model reads

$$h_{11} = 0, \quad h_{12} = -1/20, \quad h_{13} = 1/5, \quad h_{14} = 3/4 \quad (4.18)$$

This matches precisely that of our graded parafermionic theory, for which the distinct fixed charged highest-weight states are  $|0\rangle, \mathcal{B}_{-1}|0\rangle, |\tilde{\varphi}_1\rangle, \mathcal{B}_{-1}|\tilde{\varphi}_1\rangle$  of respective dimension 0, 3/4,  $-1/20$ , 1/5. We thus have the following correspondence:

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{11}\rangle &\sim |0\rangle, & |\phi_{14}\rangle &\sim \mathcal{B}_{-1}|0\rangle = |\psi_{\frac{1}{2}}\rangle \\ |\phi_{12}\rangle &\sim |\tilde{\varphi}_1\rangle, & |\phi_{13}\rangle &\sim \mathcal{B}_{-1}|\tilde{\varphi}_1\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4.19)$$

Note that this is the only  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  model that also has a description in terms of a Virasoro minimal model. Moreover, none of the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  models has a description as a superconformal minimal model.

#### 4.5. The Neveu-Schwarz and Ramond sectors

Given that the  $\mathcal{B}$  operators are fermionic, we might wonder whether there is a Neveu-Schwarz (NS) and a Ramond (R) sector in the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  models. Actually, the  $\mathcal{B}$ 's are also parafermionic and in parafermionic theories, the sectors are fixed by the charge of the state on which the operators act, i.e., that fixes the fractional part of the modes. In the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  model (equivalent to the Ising model), this fractional part either vanishes or is half-integer. This suggests that the two extremal values of  $q$ , namely 0 and  $k$ , could be thought as the realization of the R and NS sectors respectively since the fractional parts differ by 1/2. In the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_1$  model – which is quite similar to a free fermion theory as it will be shown below –, these are the only two sectors. However this analogy is not very compelling since the fractional part of successive modes, in each sector, differ by 1/2.

### 5. The $\mathbb{Z}_k$ quasi-particle basis

The  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  quasi-particle basis is also spanned by strings of a single type of  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  parafermions, say the  $\mathcal{B}$  modes:

$$\mathcal{B}_{-n_1}\mathcal{B}_{-n_2}\cdots\mathcal{B}_{-n_p}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \quad \text{with} \quad n_i \geq n_{i+1} - 1, \quad n_i \geq n_{i+2}, \quad n_p \geq 1 \quad (5.1)$$

In addition, we need to take into account the singular vector  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{k-q+1}|0\rangle = (\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1})^{k-q+1}|0\rangle$ , which implies that either

$$n_{p-2k+2q} \geq 2 \quad \text{or} \quad n_{p-2k+2q+1} \geq 1 \quad (5.2)$$

Indeed, there are two ways to terminate a sequence of pairs  $\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \cdots \mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}$ : one can either act with  $\mathcal{B}_{-2}$  or with  $\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}$  on the left. The constraint (5.2) is thus our boundary condition.

Consider now the constraint that comes from the  $\mathbb{Z}_k$  invariance of the theory. Actually, in terms of the  $\mathcal{B}$  modes, it is rather a  $\mathbb{Z}_{2k}$  invariance, namely  $(\psi_{\frac{1}{2}})^{2k} \sim \mathbb{I}$ . This implies that all weakly ordered  $\mathcal{B}$ -strings containing  $2k$  elements are not independent. In fact, there is one relation at each level. This linear relation forces the exclusion of one  $2k$ -string at each level. The chosen excluded states need to have indices ‘as equal as possible’ in order for the exclusion of the selected  $2k$ -strings within longer strings to do not generate contradictions. This governs the following choice of *excluded*  $2k$ -strings:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{B}_{-(n-1)}\mathcal{B}_{-n})^{k-j}(\mathcal{B}_{-n}\mathcal{B}_{-n})^j & \quad j = 1, \dots, k \\ (\mathcal{B}_{-n}\mathcal{B}_{-(n+1)})^{k-j}(\mathcal{B}_{-n}\mathcal{B}_{-n})^j & \quad j = 1, \dots, k \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

Phrased differently, the excluded states are those containing  $2k$ -strings of the form  $\mathcal{B}_{-n_i}\mathcal{B}_{-n_2} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{-n_{i+2k-1}}$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \textbf{Excluded :} \quad n_i &= n_{i+2k-1} - 1 \\ \text{or} & \\ n_i &= n_{i+2k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad |n_j - n_\ell| \leq 1 \\ & \quad \forall j, \ell \in [i, \dots, i+2k-1] \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Instead of characterizing those states that are excluded, one can formulate the condition in terms of allowed states, which are those general  $\mathcal{B}$  strings of the form  $\mathcal{B}_{-n_1}\mathcal{B}_{-n_2} \cdots \mathcal{B}_{-n_p}$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \textbf{Allowed :} \quad n_i &\geq n_{i+2k-1} + 1 \\ \text{or} & \\ n_i &= n_{i+2k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad n_{i+1} \geq n_{i+2k-2} + 2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

for all values of  $i \leq p - 2k + 1$ .

To make these conditions clearer, we provide some examples. For simplicity, we will again write a sequence  $\mathcal{B}_{-n_1}\mathcal{B}_{-n_2}\cdots\mathcal{B}_{-n_{2k}}$  under the form  $(n_1,\cdots n_{2k})$ . Consider first the case  $k = 2$ . The first four lowest dimensional excluded 4-strings are

$$(0101) \quad (1101) \quad (1111) \quad (1211) \quad (5.6)$$

For the first one,  $n_1 < n_4$ . In the other three cases, we have  $n_1 = n_4$  but all the differences are  $0, \pm 1$ ; hence these are also excluded. By adding to these four excluded 4-strings the partition  $(n, n, n, n)$  for any integer  $n$ , we generated all excluded 4-strings. Not that at ‘level’ 4 there is one allowed string with  $n_1 = n_4$ , which is  $(1201)$ ; it indeed satisfies  $n_2 \geq n_3 + 2$ .

As a second example, consider  $k = 3$ . The lowest dimensional excluded strings are

$$(010101) \quad (110101) \quad (111101) \quad (111111) \quad (121111) \quad (121211) \quad (5.7)$$

and again there are 6-strings with ‘level’ 4 and 5 that are allowed, namely  $(120101)$  and  $(121101)$  which are both characterized by the ‘internal difference two condition’:  $n_2 \geq n_5 + 2$ .

Let us now take the case  $k = 1$ : the lowest excluded 2-strings are  $(01)$  and  $(11)$ . In that case, the second condition in (5.5) is not applicable and thus the exclusion principle boils down to  $n_i \geq n_{i+1} + 1$ . This is actually the sole condition since it is stronger than the weak-ordering conditions (3.16). We thus end up with a purely fermionic Fock basis for the  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_1$  model.

Another example is reported in app. B.

## 6. Conclusions

The main result of this work is the presentation of the two bases of states for the  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  parafermionic model. At first we have obtained the weak ordering condition for a free  $\mathcal{B}$  basis by means of a bijection with  $\mathbb{Z}_3$   $\mathcal{A}$ -strings. The same ordering applies to  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$ -strings. Since there is no mixed ordering, this fixes the standard basis. On the other hand, the quasi-particle basis is obtained from an ordered  $\mathcal{B}$  basis on which we implement the  $\mathbb{Z}_{2k}$  invariance; the effect of this constraint is captured by an effective  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  exclusion principle.

As a side result, we have clarified: (1) some aspects of the representation theory of the  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  models by displaying the full set of singular vectors in closed form and (2) the spectrum of the theory, including the field identifications.

Of course, the immediate extension of this work is to write down the bosonic and fermionic-type character formulae. The later is somewhat complicated by the fact that we do not count genuine restricted partitions. But apart from this, we can identify other natural avenues for future work.

The  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  model is the simplest  $\widehat{g}/\widehat{u}(1)^r$  model for which  $g$  is a super Lie algebra. It would be interesting to consider other examples of super models of that sort. However, the  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  model has a more naive generalization which could be formulated as follows. For any (nonsuper) Lie algebra  $g$ , we could extend the  $\widehat{g}/\widehat{u}(1)^r$  theory by adding to the set of fundamental parafermions  $\psi_1^{\alpha_i}$ , where  $\alpha_i$  is a simple root, their ‘square roots’  $\psi_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\alpha_i}$ . That would define a candidate graded version of the  $\widehat{g}/\widehat{u}(1)^r$  model. Whether this actually defines a model satisfying associativity and whether it is related to a specific parafermionic theory based on a super affine Lie algebra remains to be checked.

Another natural future problem is to study the integrable deformations of the  $\widehat{osp}(1, 2)_k/\widehat{u}(1)$  model and their flows. In relations with the results of the present paper, it will be of interest to identify the precise integrable perturbation associated to the quasi-particle basis obtained here.

We end with an observation that is potentially interesting from the point of view of condensed matter applications: the  $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$  models in the limit  $k \rightarrow \infty$  provide a well-defined limiting approach to a  $c = 0$  theory.

## Appendix A. The ‘primary’ $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_k$ singular vectors

In this appendix, we demonstrate that the two vectors  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{k-q+1}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  and  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2q+1}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$  are singular. In the first case, we first establish the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_p(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= 0 & p \geq 0, & \quad \forall n \\ \mathcal{B}_p(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= 0 & p \geq 0, & \quad \forall n \\ \mathcal{B}_p^\dagger(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= 0 & p \geq 1, & \quad \forall n \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

in this order, the first (second) relation being used in the proof of the second (third) one. All these relations are easily verified for  $n = 1$  by a direct application of the generalized commutation relations. The general case is proved by induction. At this point, the value of  $n$  is still free. To verify the remaining condition,  $\mathcal{A}_p^\dagger(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$ , we introduce a variant of the second commutator in (2.8):<sup>12</sup>

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{-2/k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{A}_{n-l} \mathcal{A}_{m+l}^\dagger - \mathcal{A}_{m-l}^\dagger \mathcal{A}_{n+l} \right] \phi_q(0) = \left( \frac{q}{k} + n \right) \delta_{n+m,0} \phi_q(0) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This allows us to show readily that

$$\mathcal{A}_p^\dagger(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0 \quad p \geq 2, \quad \forall n \quad (\text{A.3})$$

again by induction. The final condition is

$$\mathcal{A}_1^\dagger(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = \frac{(n-1)}{k} (q+n-1-k) (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^{n-1}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle \quad (\text{A.4})$$

whose vanishing is verified only for  $n = k - q + 1$ .

For the vector  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{2q+1}|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle$ , we proceed similarly, obtaining first

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_p^\dagger(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= 0 \quad p \geq 1, \quad \forall n \\ \mathcal{B}_p^\dagger(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle &= 0 \quad p \geq 1, \quad \forall n \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It remains to consider the  $\mathcal{B}_p$  condition (which implies the  $\mathcal{A}_p$  one) and for this we use

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_{-2/k}^{(l)} \left[ \mathcal{B}_{n-l} \mathcal{B}_{m+l}^\dagger + \mathcal{B}_{m-l}^\dagger \mathcal{B}_{n+l} \right] \phi_q(0) = \left( \frac{q}{2k} + n \right) \delta_{n+m,0} \phi_q(0) \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Again the case  $p \geq 1$  is direct

$$\mathcal{B}_p(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0 \quad p \geq 1, \quad \forall n \quad (\text{A.7})$$

while imposing the  $\mathcal{B}_0$  highest-weight condition leads to

$$\mathcal{B}_0(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = \frac{n}{4k} (2q - n - 1) (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^n|\tilde{\varphi}_q\rangle = 0 \quad (\text{A.8})$$

which is zero if and only if  $n = 2q + 1$ .

This argument extends directly to the general case: it relies simply on the fact the considered power of  $\mathcal{A}_{-1}$  or  $\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger$  act on a highest-weight state and that the highest-weight state condition forces a precise relation between its dimension and its charge.

---

<sup>12</sup> In this way we do not have to know the commutator of  $\mathcal{O}_m^{(1)}$  with the  $\mathcal{A}$  modes as well as its zero-mode eigenvalue on a generic state.

## Appendix B. Standard vs quasi-fermionic basis: counting the first few states in chargeless vacuum module of $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_3$ model

To illustrate the construction of a module level-by-level by using the two bases constructed in this work, we write down the different states that occur at level  $s = 5$  in the vacuum module of zero relative charge in the  $k = 3$  model.

*B.1. The standard  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_3$  basis ( $q = 0, r = 0, k = 3, s = 5$ )*

Zero charge states in the vacuum module are generated by

$$\mathcal{B}_{-n_1}\mathcal{B}_{-n_2}\cdots\mathcal{B}_{-n_p}\mathcal{B}_{-m_1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-m_2}^\dagger\cdots\mathcal{B}_{-m_p}^\dagger|0\rangle \quad (\text{B.1})$$

with the weak ordering conditions

$$n_i \geq n_{i+1} - 1, \quad n_i \geq n_{i+2}, \quad n_p \geq 1, \quad m_i \geq m_{i+1} - 1, \quad m_i \geq m_{i+2}, \quad m_p \geq 0 \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for any integer  $p$ . The level of such a state is determined by the conformal dimension of the string, which itself depends upon the fractional value of its modes. However, it is simple to check that when the number of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{B}^\dagger$  factors is the same, the fractional parts add up to zero. Therefore the level  $s$  is given by

$$s = \sum_i (n_i + m_i) \quad (\text{B.3})$$

For the vacuum module of the  $k = 3$  model at level  $s \leq 5$ , the following singular vectors need to be taken into account:

$$\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger|0\rangle, \quad (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle, \quad (\mathcal{A}_{-1})^5\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger|0\rangle \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We must subtract the contribution of the first two and add up that of the third one. The effect of the first one can be implemented by enforcing  $m_p \geq 1$  in (B.1). With this

constraint, we find 18 states at level 5:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{B}_{-4}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-2}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-3}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-4}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-2}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-3}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-2}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger \\
\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger & \mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger
\end{array} \tag{B.5}$$

We now subtract those states that are descendants of the singular vector  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle$ . Its lowest dimensional descendant of charge zero is  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^8(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle$ , which occurs at level 4. At level 5, there are four descendants, namely:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^7(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle, & \mathcal{B}_0^\dagger\mathcal{B}_{-1}^\dagger(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^6(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle \\
& (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^9\mathcal{B}_{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle, & (\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^{10}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

Finally, because  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^5\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger|0\rangle$  is a descendant of both  $\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger|0\rangle$  and  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^4|0\rangle$ , we need to add the contribution of the zero-charge descendants of  $(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^5\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger|0\rangle$ . At level 5, there is a single such state:  $(\mathcal{B}_0^\dagger)^9(\mathcal{A}_{-1})^5|0\rangle$ . The total number of states at level 5 is thus  $18 - 4 + 1 = 15$ .

## B.2. The quasi-particle $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_3$ basis ( $q = 0, r = 0, k = 3, s = 5$ )

In that case, we need to consider  $\mathcal{B}$ -strings of length  $p = m2k$  subject, in addition to the weak ordering conditions (3.16), to the  $\tilde{\mathbb{Z}}_3$  exclusion principle.

At first, let us compute the level of a  $\mathcal{B}$ -string of length  $p$  acting on a state of charge  $q$ . The fractional part  $F$  is found to be

$$F = \frac{p(2q+p)}{4k} = m(q+mk) \quad \text{when} \quad p = m2k \tag{B.7}$$

For  $q = 0$  and  $k = 3$ , the contribution of the fractional part to the conformal dimension is thus  $-3m^2$ , i.e.,

$$s = -3m^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{6m} n_i \tag{B.8}$$

The contributing 6-strings at level 5 are:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\mathcal{B}_{-5}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} & \mathcal{B}_{-4}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-4}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} & \mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} & \mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} & \mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} & \mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1} & \mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-1}
\end{array} \tag{B.9}$$

There are also three contributing 12-strings:

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1} \\
\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-3}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_{-2}\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}\mathcal{B}_0\mathcal{B}_{-1}
\end{array} \tag{B.10}$$

At level 5, there are no contributing longer strings. Therefore the total number of states is  $12 + 3 = 15$ .

### Acknowledgment

We thank IPAM and the organizers of the CFT 2001 semester for their hospitality while this work was being done. We thank H. Saleur and R. Kedem for useful discussions. NSERC is acknowledged for the financial support.

### REFERENCES

1. R. Kedem, T.R. Klassen, B. M. McCoy and E. Melzer, Phys. Lett. **B304** (1993) 263.
2. E. Melzer, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A9** (1994) 133.
3. P. Jacob and P. Mathieu, *Parafermionic quasi-particle basis and fermionic-type characters*, Nucl. Phys. B - to appear, hep-th/0108063
4. J. Lepowsky and M. Primc, Contemporary Mathematics **46** AMS, Providence, 1985.
5. B.L. Feigin and A.V. Stoyanovski, RIMS 982, hep-th/ Func, Anal. Appl. **28** (1994) 68; B.L. Feigin and T. Miwa, in *Statistical physics at the eve of the 21st century*, Series on Adv. in Stat. Mech., vol 14, ed. by M.T Batchelor and L.T. White, World Scientific, 1999; B. Feigin, R. Kedem, S. Loktev, T. Miwa, E. Mukhin, Transformation Groups, **6** (2001) 25.
6. V. Kac, *Modular invariance in mathematics and physics*, address at the centennial of the AMS, (1988).



7. B.L. Feigin, T. Nakanishi and H. Ooguri, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A7** Suppl. **1A** (1992) 217.
8. B.L. Feigin and E. Frenkel, Adv. Sov. Math. **16** (1993) 139.
9. D. Bernard, V. Pasquier and D. Serban, Nucl. Phys. **B 428** (1994) 612.
10. P. Bouwknegt, A.A. Ludwig and K. Schoutens, Phys. Lett. **B 338** (1994) 448; **B 359** (1995) 304.
11. P. Bouwknegt and K. Schoutens, Nucl. Phys. B 482 (1996) 345; *Spinon decomposition and Yangian structure of  $(sl_n)$  modules* to appear in *Geometric Analysis and Lie Theory in Mathematics and Physics*, Lecture Notes Series of the Australian Mathematical Society..
12. F.D.M. Haldane, Z.N.C. Ha, J.C. Talstra, D. Bernard and V. Pasquier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 2021.
13. A.B. Zamolodchikov and V.A. Fateev, Sov. Phys. JETP **43** (1985) 215.
14. J. Lepowsky and R.L. Wilson, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **78** (1981) 7254.
15. C. Dong and J. Lepowsky *Generalized vertex algebras and relative vertex operators*, Birkhäuser, 1993.
16. K. Schoutens, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 2608; P. Bouwknegt. and K. Schoutens, Nucl. Phys. **B 547** (1999) 501.
17. F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 937.
18. A. Berkovich and B.M. McCoy, in *Statistical physics at the eve of the 21st century*, Series on Adv. in Stat. Mech., vol 14, ed. by M.T Batchelor and L.T. White, World Scientific, 1999.
19. J. M. Camino, A. V. Ramallo and J. M. Sanchez de Santos, Nucl.Phys. **B530** (1998) 715.
20. P. Jacob and P. Mathieu, *Parafermionic Jacobi identities, Sugawara construction and generalized commutation relations*, in preparation.
21. P. Jacob and P. Mathieu, Nucl. Phys. **B 587** (2000) 514.
22. J.-B. Fan and M. Yu, *Modules over affine Lie superalgebras*, hep-th/9304122.